

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-26, and 29-36 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 16, 17, and 22 are independent. Claims 14 and 26-27 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter included therein. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101; rejected claims 1-2, 6-12, 15-17, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Lazzouni et al.* (USP 5,652,412); rejected claims 3-4, and 18 under 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lazzouni et al.* in view of *Henderson* (USP 5,897,648); rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lazzouni et al.* in view of *Skinner* (USP 6,661,920); and rejected claims 14, 19-21, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lazzouni et al.* in view of *Dymetman et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0020750). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating claim 5 includes allowable subject matter.

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding

the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §101

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claim 15, by this amendment, Applicants have amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner. Based upon this amendment, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 - *Lazzouni et al.*

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 asserting *Lazzouni et al.* teaches all of the claim elements. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that *Lazzouni et al.* discloses transferring document information to a printing device adapted to print the document information on a surface having a position coding pattern. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, transferring document information to a printing device adapted to print the document information on a surface having a position-coding pattern, the position-coding pattern comprising symbols associated with grid points of a grid and coding a plurality of positions on the surface, each position being coded by

a plurality of the symbols, wherein each symbol contributes to the coding of more than one of the plurality of positions.

The disclosure of *Lazzouni et al.* is directed to a pen and paper information recording system. *Lazzouni et al.* discloses a writing surface that includes a prerecorded pattern of pixels associated with the writing surface. Each of the pixels contains encoded optically readable position information, which identifies an absolute coordinate position on the writing surface (col. 3, lines 10-14).

Each of the pixels includes a plurality of vertical lines for encoding an X coordinate of the pixel and a plurality of horizontal lines for encoding a Y coordinate of the pixel. Each pixel further includes vertical and horizontal delimiter lines for defining the boundary of the pixel (col. 3, lines 15-20). Each pixel defines a unique coordinate position on the surface of the surface where the uniqueness of each pixel is established by an algorithm which orders the vertical and horizontal data lines.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Lazzouni et al.* that is directed to the position-coding pattern comprising symbols associated with grid points of a grid and coding a plurality of positions on the surface, **each position being coded by a plurality of the symbols, wherein each symbol contributes to the coding of more than one of the plurality of positions**. As such, *Lazzouni et al.* fails to anticipate claim 1, as amended.

Claims dependent on claim 1 are allowable at least based upon their dependency on allowable claim 1. Claim 16 includes elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus claim 16, together with claims dependent thereon, are not anticipated by *Lazzouni et al.*

Claim 22 recites, *inter alia*, printing the document information on a surface, wherein the surface contains a readable code contained thereon in addition to the printed document information, wherein the readable code comprises a grid and a plurality of symbols, the value of each symbol being determined by a displacement of a marking in relation to the grid. However, as noted above with regard to claim 1, *Lazzouni et al.* discloses each pixel defines a unique coordinate position on the surface where the uniqueness of each pixel is established by an algorithm which orders the vertical and horizontal data lines.

As such, Applicants submit there is no teaching or suggestion in *Lazzouni et al.* that is directed to wherein the readable code comprises a grid and a plurality of symbols, the value of each symbol being determined by a displacement of a marking in relation to the grid. As such, Applicants maintain that claim 22, together with claims dependent thereon, are not anticipated by *Lazzouni et al.*

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 -
Lazzouni et al./Dymetman

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 2 to include the elements of claim 14. In the outstanding rejection, the Examiner rejected claim 14 asserting the combination of the teachings of *Lazzouni et al.* and *Dymetman* render claim 14 obvious. In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 14, the Examiner asserts that *Lazzouni et al.* discloses initially registering the document in a pattern administration unit wherein the pattern administration unit assigns a unique subset of the position-coding pattern citing to Figs. 4-5, and col. 6, line 35 through col. 8, line 21. The Examiner admits that *Lazzouni et al.* fails to teach or suggest the pattern administration unit that assigns a unique subset of the position-coding pattern to each page of the document. However, the Examiner relies on the teachings of *Dymetman* to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Lazzouni et al.* citing to paragraphs 0013-0017 and Figs. 3-7. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of these references.

The disclosure of *Lazzouni et al.* provides for offset printing wherein, prior to printing, two printing plates are fabricated wherein one plate contains delimiter lines and the other plate contains the data lines (col. 8, lines 24-27). However, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Lazzouni et al.* that discloses initially

registering said document in a pattern administration unit. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Lazzouni et al.* that teaches or suggests the pattern administration unit assigning a unique subset of position-coding pattern to each page of said registered document.

Dymetman fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Lazzouni*. The disclosure of *Dymetman* is directed to a marking medium area with encoded identifier for producing action through a network. In paragraph 0108, *Dymetman* discloses that a coded substrate supplier could use various techniques to produce machine-readable markings. In paragraph 0118, *Dymetman* provides for an encoded representation of a page identifier, an item of data whose value uniquely identifies the page. As described with regard to Fig. 12 and paragraph 0165, memory locations are initialized for storing two network addresses, an address for a peripheral device and an address of a digital page. In other words, *Dymetman* discloses printing the coded substrate and then associating actions based on the already printed substrate.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, a method for editing a document, the method comprising initially registering said document in a pattern administration unit; the pattern administration unit assigning a unique subset of position-coding pattern to each page of said registered document; transferring information indicative of the

unique subset of the position-coding pattern, assigned by the pattern administration unit, to a printing device adapted to print the position-coding pattern on a surface; and transferring document information to the printing device adapted to print the document information on the surface.

There is no teaching or suggestion in *Dymetman* that is directed to initially registering said document in a pattern administration unit and then the pattern administration unit assigning a unique subset of position-coding pattern to each page of said registered document. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in either *Dymetman* or *Lazzouni et al.*, assuming these references are combinable, which Applicants do not admit, that is directed to transferring information indicative of the unique subset of the position-coding pattern, assigned by the pattern administration unit, to a printing device adapted to print the position-coding pattern on a surface; and transferring document information to the printing device adapted to print the document information on the surface. Neither *Dymetman* nor *Lazzouni et al.* teach transferring the document information and the information indicative of a subset of the position-coding pattern to the same printing device.

At least for these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 2, as amended, is not obvious over the references as cited by the

Examiner. As such, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

Claims dependent on claim 2 are allowable at least based upon their dependency on allowable claim 2. Claim 17 includes elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 2 and thus claim 17, together with claims dependent thereon, are not obvious over the references as cited by the Examiner.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP


Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

MKM/CMV/mmi
3782-0124P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

(Rev. 02/12/2004)